

**REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated October 29, 2004.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, requiring that FIG. 1 be labeled as prior art and noting that reference numerals 20 and 22 each referred to two separate elements. Appended to this Amendment is a corrected FIG. 1 that corrects each of these errors.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract because it did not include 50 words. The abstract has been amended to include 50 words.

The Examiner objected to the specification because reference numerals 20 and 22 were each used therein to describe two separate elements. The specification has been amended to correct this error.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Attached is a Terminal Disclaimer that overcomes this rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, and the attached Terminal Disclaimer, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel. No.: (503) 227-5631

Appl. No. 10/791,315  
Amdt. dated April 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2004

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Appended to this Amendment is a replacement drawing sheet showing corrected FIG. 1.

Appl. No. 10/791,315  
Amdt. dated April 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2004

**APPENDIX**

Attached is a replacement drawing sheet showing corrected FIG. 1.